

1 of 4

FILE

JAMES H. CUNNINGHAM

CMC State Prison

P.O. BOX 8101

SAN LUIS OBISPO, CA 93409-8101

FILED

MAR 24 2008

CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
BY NYT DEPUTYIN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT
COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NO. 07cv2183 DMS (RBB)

JAMES H. CUNNINGHAM

Petitioner

John Marshall (warden)

respondent

REQUEST: Appointment of Counsel
for the incompetent:
And Mentally Ill

To The Honorable Courts:

I James H. Cunningham would like to move the courts to uphold Fed-Digest. As stated Federal Court digest rights and necessity Federal-Law: after it was determined that Pro se habeas Petition could not be dismissed for failure to prosecute without first holding a competency hearing. District Court could appoint counsel to represent Petitioner at competency hearing if it determined that such appointment was advisable. Rules governing 2254 cases, Rule 8(c), 28 U.S.C.A. foll. 2254.

In addition the Code of Civil Procedure: 2016.310 Title 4. Civil-Discovery act #15 Physical or Mental Examination. Article *1 General Provision CH. 172 of Reg. sess. URGENT legislation *2032.020. Person Subject to discovery: Qualifications of Examining Physicians and Psychologists

2014

(A)(B)(C) C.C.P.(A)(B)(C) SECTION 1013: Article #9 (A)(B).

PETITIONER will be using federal & State Law & authorities to be effective and in align with this request. So to sustain audience interest and attention with introduction. So PETITIONER hope and Pray for rights and NECESSITY.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

2019.DID Approved Methods: ANY party may obtain discovery by ONE OR MORE of the following Methods:

(A). Oral and written depositions

(b.) Interrogatories to a Party

(C.) Inspection of documents, things and Places

(D.) Physical and Mental Examination

(E) Request for admission¹

(F.) Simultaneous Exchange of expert trial witness information

PETITIONER INSERT this request may be premature. So to stay within the interlope PETITIONER is fertilizing District Court with the above and forgoing request

REQUESTING APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL

There is NO absolute right to counsel in non-death Penalty:

federal habeas case. 234: CHANEY V. LEWIS (9th Cir 1986) 801 F.2d 1191

3 of 4

1 HOWEVER COUNSEL MUST BE APPOINTED IF AN EVIDENTIARY HEARINGS ARE
2 NECESSARY. *235: Federal Rules of habeas Corpus rule *8(C).

3
4 IF COUNSEL IS REQUIRED FOR EFFECTIVE USE OF DISCOVERY *236
5 FEDERAL Rules of Habeas Corpus, Rule *6(A).

6
7 OR IF COUNSEL IS REQUIRED TO AFFORD DUE PROCESS. PARTICULARLY
8 IN COMPLEX CASES. HOSE V. BELL (2006) 126 Sct at 2087 actual innocence
9 JENCKS V. UNITED STATES (1957) 353 U.S. 657, 77 Sct 1007, impeachment
10 DRETKE V. HALEY (2004) 541 US 386, 124 Sct 1847) Miscarriage of Justice
11 DILLON V. UNITED STATES (9th Cir 1962) 307 F. 2d 445.

12 13 APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL

14 FEDERAL JUDGES ALSO HAVE THE DISCRETION TO APPOINT COUNSEL IN
15 OTHER CIRCUMSTANCES IF IT IS IN THE INTERESTS OF JUSTICE:

16 SARGAND V. PORTER 479 F. 3d at 677 (9th Cir 2007) Shepardized from winship

17 THEREFORE COURTS MAKING SUCH A DETERMINATION WILL CONSIDER THE
18 STRENGTH OF THE ISSUES. THE PETITIONERS ABILITY TO ARTICULATE THE
19 CLAIMS. PETITIONER ALSO SUFFERS FROM EMOTIONAL DISORDER. AND FINDS IT TO
20 BE AN COMPLEXITY OF ISSUES: *238: 18 U.S. 3006 A, 28 USC 1915(d)
21 2254(H); FEDERAL Rules of Habeas Corpus, Rule 8(c); BASTON V. RISLEY
22 (9th Cir 1984) 730 F. 2d 1228.

23 24 IN DETERMINING COUNSEL

25 WHETHER: APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL IS NECESSARY IN CASE INVOLVING
26 PARTY WHO IS UNABLE TO REPRESENT HIMSELF BECAUSE
27 HE IS MINOR OR OTHERWISE INCOMPETENT, COURT SHOULD CONSIDER
28 FACT THAT, WITHOUT APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL, CASE WILL NOT GO

4 of 4

at all WENGER V. Canastota CENT. Sch Dist. (1998) CA 2 NY 146 123, 41 F
744. CERT: den (1999) 526 US 1025 143 L Ed 2d 363; Ct 1267.

Disclarants

I, JAMES Cunningham ask in plead to appoint Guardian ad Litem
Petitioner holds 4th California rules of Court, starting with Rule 110.
request for accommodations. So without the Honorable Courts
Possibly by chance violate amendments. I submitted for judgement
these rules of Court for the incompetence of Petitioner.
I plea for greater Counsel respectfully speaking Petitioner
has been enthusiastic about his Petition.

Petitioner would like to state in his pursuants of relief he has
been unsuccessful as being Laiman. Petitioner legal obligation
for disruption. Petitioner plead with the Courts to comply with
the California rules of Court (especially with Law always
changing on to rely on the Library Yesterdays filings

I JAMES Cunningham swear under Penalty
and Perjury to MY knowledge the above is true

DATE: 3-18-08

Sign

